

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

Engineering Auditorium (rm189)

**Academic Senate  
October 5, 1998, 2:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

I. Meeting was called to order at 2:10 and roll call was taken. All were present except Bain, Barba, Burak, Doordan, Gonzales, McNeil, Payne, Rascoe, Schmidt, G. Singh, Vanniarajan, and Veregge.

II. The minutes of September 14, 1998 were approved with corrections.

III. Communications and Questions

A. From the Chair of the Senate

The Chair made several announcements.

The Senate Special Committee on the Joint Library Project is co-sponsoring with Associated Students **Open Hearings on the Joint Library Project** to be held Wednesday, October 28, 1998 from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. in the Student Union Ballroom. The committee will direct questions to a panel of experts and then questions will be opened to the university community. All students, faculty, and staff are encouraged to attend.

The Senate Half-day Retreat is November 16, 1998 from 11:30 -4:30 at the Phyllis Forward Simpkins International House on Eleventh Street. The focus of the Retreat is the Proposed Joint Library Project. Please mark your calendars and RSVP. Senator Gorney-Moreno is in charge for the organization of this retreat.

Loretta Mae, AOA for the Academic Senate Office, has resigned.

Lydia Rose, the temporary AOA, is willing to accept the permanent AOA position for the Academic Senate.

It is very difficult to hear everyone. It would be helpful to use the floating microphones so that all members of the senate may hear.

There were no questions for the chair.

Information Item was offered: Jonathan Roth was given the floor to Announce a Rally against the Proposed Joint Library Project sponsored by Save Our University Library (SOUL) in front of the Amphitheatre on October 14 from noon to 1 p.m.

B. From the President of the University

President Caret: On to the way to Executive Committee a couple of hours ago, a faculty member accosted me and asked me when I was going to be getting rid of the water in the walkway in front of his building. Similarly, a week ago a faculty member grabbed me and said, "You promised you would renovate faculty offices; Which ones are you doing?" My initial thought was "Ah! Doubt. They don't believe it's occurring." The next statement was -- they wanted to know how they could get higher on the list. So there is an information item going out, and I just want to bring it to your attention -- Every faculty office is going to be renovated. Every office will be painted, rewired, and new blinds will be installed. Of course that's going to cause other problems: faculty will have to

clear their offices during the renovations.

I promised to give a brief update on the library. There are days where I would like to be wearing a SOUL button. I'm trying to save our university library, too. I'm just trying to use a different approach. It was an unfortunate quote in the Mercury News that was attributed to an individual who is really a clerical aide in our public Affairs office; the quote was something like the President can do what ever he wants to, whether the senate wants it or not. I think all of us who have been involved in academic senates most of our careers know that the truth is if you don't want to be President anymore you can do whatever you want to but not for very long. That's not how I work and many of you have worked with me now for several years and realize that's not how I work. And some of you may be new to the senate, so I want to take this moment to say I feel a healthy campus is a campus in which the administration and the faculty, in the traditional joint governance sense, find a way to do things together. When you pass a policy recommendation, it comes to my desk for signature and I want to be in a position to sign it. That's how we work. I think in the four years I have been here there has only been one policy passed that sat on my desk that I could not sign. We modified it ever so slightly, and I then signed it. I've always worked that way on projects, including the Joint Library Project. We have not tried to do anything behind closed doors. If anything, we have gone aggressively the other direction trying to find as much media coverage as possible on a project that we are continually working on. There's a lot of misinformation out there. One of the pamphlets I got from SOUL -- and I respect a lot of people who are on SOUL -- but one of the pamphlets says we are giving away our building, our land, and all we get is the basement and the attic. Well, the basement and the attic happen to be something like five floors, but it doesn't mention that; they just say the basement and the attic. If you are going to be participating in dialog and decision making, it is common knowledge that you need to know what the key facts are. With that little bit of politics aside. We will have at each meeting a brief, one page, two-sided update on where we are and the key issues on the library project, which are the developmental MOU -- which is how are we going to build it if we build it -- and the operational MOU -- which is how are we going to run it. Don Kassing has such a document; he modified it slightly after the executive committee and it's being reprinted right now. It will be available to you before you leave today. We hope to give you substantive information on the meetings we have until the end of the year. There are about four, big scheduled meetings in the future.

One thing to keep in mind about the library: we can talk about what might be all the time. But what IS, is the following. We either find a way to do this project together to get a state of the art facility that will serve us for the next 100 years, or we live with what we have. Too many people are in the middle someplace, saying, "Well, let's take our \$90,000,000 or \$100,000,000 dollars and build our own facility. That is not an option.

The only reason we have this money to have this deal is because we have sources other than California State University sources provided to us that allows us to then take California State University resources that every other campus is fighting for. If anyone says we can take this money and build our own library in our own lifetime, they are naive. We have just two options: Find a way to make this work or don't do it and live with what we've got. I'm not particularly happy with what we've got and the way it runs. I would like to find something that's state of the art and will serve us for the next hundred years. So that's the summary on both the library and faculty offices.

The other two critical issues, and believe me we are all trying to figure out where we are on these, are the relocation of people during the times of construction on any of the construction projects we are looking at, including the library, and parking. I hope you understand that I have been looking at this for well over two years. I have not just been sitting in my office hoping that something will happen. There are plans going on and there are lots of ideas and plans to be put in place.

### Questions to the President:

Huebner: With respect to the renovating of the offices. Does this also affect those who don't have faculty offices and who are currently housed in classrooms with temporary dividers between them? And a related issue, I'm in the college of Humanities and the Arts and I recall several years ago that our college was asked to examine numerous plans or building schematics for the Humanities Building and then nothing seemed to happen with that. I was wondering if the resources for the library are drawing away from that and when we are going to be looking at things like adequate classroom space.

The President informed the senate that he had put together a committee to look at space management and ways the campus will grow in the next 10-20 years. We have a long-term plan that will be distributed when we come to a consensus on a draft of what the campus might look like. The day-to-day space issues can only be solved by changing views of space ownership and reallocation of underused university space to departments experiencing space crunches.

On the question of project priorities, the president explained to the senate that campuses compete for funds at the CSU level. Each campus is allowed one project per year for consideration. Twenty-three campuses put in twenty-three projects. Approximately 3 to 4 are funded at construction level. Any project on that list increases in priority if 50-70% of the funding is already raised. To keep one of our projects on the list to be funded is a constant challenge. If we could leverage other projects on that list, we would.

Senator Desautel asked about the off-site relocation and parking issues regarding the proposed joint library project. The president assured him that the forums will have people available who have answers to those questions.

Senator Roth asked a question about the alternatives to a joint library project with the possibilities of voters supporting and committing to educational improvement efforts and the notion of funding for an annex to Clark Library. The president explained that even with voter support and commitment to educational improvements through bonds, SJSU is still competing with other CSU campuses and a state-of-the-art facility like the proposed Joint Library is unlikely to get priority over other campuses when we have a library that could be described as sufficient. An annex to the existing library would not solve any problems, but would just delay the issue.

Senator Young said from his years of experience with past presidents, that President Caret was doing a good job.

Senator Young also wanted to make the president aware that the automated doors for disabled students many times are not activated early in the morning. The president was very concerned to hear this and asked VP Kassing to look into this problem. He also announced that there were detailed plans for physical accessibility and use and as well as programic accessibility, but they are still going through case by case. As budget money becomes available, we are putting more money into this area.

#### IV. Executive Committee Report

A. Minutes of Executive Committee: No questions on the minutes.

#### B. Consent Calendar

Three additions appointments were added by Senator Shifflett; Jan Johnston on SERB seat E; Juana Acrivos on SERB seat B, and Cynthia Llanes on Student Fairness Committee on the ex officio

Administration seat. There were no objections to those appointments.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: No action items to announce.

V. Unfinished Business: None

VI Policy Committee Action Items. In rotation.

A. Committee on Committees/Election Committee -- No report.

B. Professional Standards Committee -- No Report

C. Curriculum and Research Committee -- Pat Hamill standing in for Ann Doordan.

A.S. 1041 - Intellectual/Creative Properties -- Final Reading

Senator Hamill reminded the senate that this proposal was presented to the senate and then was taken back to the committee for some minor changes that were made. This policy was first presented by Serena Stanford.

Dr. Ibrahim, Acting AVP for Graduate Studies and Research, pointed out that the main changes were made on the phrase "a reasonable amount of time" to make it more standardized.

Debate on AS 1041: Senator Peter spoke in favor of AS 1041 describing how it simplified our policies and responded to the new issues that have come about from new teaching techniques and materials and was pleased that protections were in place in this proposal. Of particular mention was the base minimum for faculty at 50 percent of royalties.

Senator Novak also spoke in favor of AS 1041. Unless we had something in place, you would be dealing with things on a one-on-one basis, and this proposal seems to be the best way to handle issues on a university-wide agreement. This proposal would solve problems before they arise.

Senator Mesher was concerned with ownership issues since the 50% issue could potentially be a problem when selling the rights. Dr. Ibrahim underscored the point that this policy was a way to institute a way to deal with disputes. Senator Mesher pointed out that when someone has a majority of the rights, issues could be handled, but if the copyright was split 50/50 that problems could arise and probably should be given consideration. Dr. Ibrahim had no objection to a clarification there.

As a point of information, Senator Stacks asked if the minimum was 51 percent if that would settled the issues. Senator Mesher did not think that the University would support that. Senator Roth pointed out that the royalties would be split not the copyright. The copyright usually belongs to the faculty member. Mesher pointed out that in 2.0, the word "jointly" was a potential problem. Senator Roth explained that those issues are settled in the agreement. Senator Mesher did not offer any amendment. President Caret described how footnotes could be added to copyright agreements to settle issues. Senator Hamill pointed out that section 2.0 allowed for questions of copyrights could be resolved in the agreements prior to the start of collaboration. The agreement that is created ahead of time would take care of these questions.

Chair Stacks reminded the senate that at this point debate focus on support or opposition to AS 1041 and that one could offer amendments at this point. No amendments were offered. No further questions. Chair Stacks then called for a voice vote. The proposal passed with a unanimous voice vote.

D. Organization and Government Committee

## A.S. 1036 - Selection and Review of Administrators -- Final Reading

Senator Brent gave the history of this referral. Organization and Government Committee was asked to review the existing policies on the review of administrators and was asked to consolidate the four existing university policies and one presidential directive into a single policy and advise on improvements and or revisions. This is the third time this policy has been before the senate. During the second reading it was referred back to committee.

The committee sent out a survey to 76 faculty/staff administrators and individuals that have served on various review committees during the previous four years. Out of 76 a response rate of 53% was achieved. Through the survey, the committee found that there was not a whole lot of unhappiness with the existing policies. Criticisms tended to be idiosyncratic rather than systematic. Based on the findings of the survey, the O&G committee proceeded in two stages. First, they examined the language and adopted language that was similar to all three policies. Where the policies differed, they made choices. One early decision was to make procedures uniform from office to office. As a result the language was kept general except with the decanal search and review committees.

Senator Brent's presentation of the policy focused on "how the new policy differs from the existing policy" and "how the policy differs from when it was first presented to the senate." Senator Brent prepared and distributed a chart that compared the various policies. Membership on review committees is almost identical so no chart was presented on that variable. The new policy is more flexible in terms of membership. Decanal searches are included in this policy and are handled at the college level.

Changes to this policy were a result of previous senate debate. The committee wants general language for vice presidents, academic administrators, and the library director. The last time this policy was before you, it stated that the president could pick the members of those committees in consultation with the executive committee. There was concern expressed during the last debate on this policy that this gave the president too much power. The committee engaged the president in negotiations; that language has now been changed where the members of these committees are selected by mutual consent of the president and the executive committee. This change, according to Senator Brent, gives the senate more influence than current policy. Currently the selection of vice presidents is selected under a presidential directive and the president picks membership in consultation with Executive Committee. There is a provision in the new policy that says "if mutual consent can not be reached between the president and the Executive Committee, then after consulting with the chair of the Academic Senate, the president does have the power to go ahead and appoint the members of the committee, but in essence he already has that power anyway.

The other change is the inclusion of a sentence at the request of Provost Bain, that permits the search review committees for Deans to be expanded from seven to eight -- an option to give the Provost an opportunity to appoint a representative of the community.

### Question and Answers.

Senator Brent offered a friendly amendment under II., 5., c. "before forwarding the report, the review committee shall" I would offer that we omit "the report." There were no objections.

Senator Brent reported that the Executive Committee recommended that two other friendly amendments. First friendly: remove II., 6. a. reword it and move it up to II., 5. d. It would read "The president shall consult with the review committee to share his or her inclination and the

reasons therefore." There were no objections

The second friendly amendment is to add under I.3. Composition of Search Committee. The words "area of management responsibility" line four after the phrase "with respect to lower as well as upper faculty ranks." So that now reads after "Faculty, students, and administrators shall all be represented." "Consideration should be given to breadth of representation, with respect to lower as well as upper faculty ranks, area of management responsibility, and with respect to gender and ethnicity."

Senator Canziani inquired about the meaning of the change. Senator Brent responded that this meant that for each search, people who are in that area ought to be represented. There were no objections to the friendly amendment.

Senator Canziani asked where the job descriptions get constructed before the search begins. Senator Brent referred to the President. President Caret described the construction of current job descriptions as going through a process where each position has its own path. Usually a reviewing the current job descriptions occurs, what is going on in and around the system, and around the country is noted, and the committee takes that information, and a draft of the description is reviewed.

Senator Gorney-Moreno asked that with the change of the friendly in section I.3. under "Consideration" the inclusion of area of management responsibility, librarians would then be able to serve on these committees?

Senator Brent informed Senator Gorney-Moreno that even without that change they would be eligible to serve on those committees. Now the policy reads that consideration should be given specifically that they should serve on these committees. The committee would just assume that that would happen anyway.

Debate.

Senator Mullen offered an amendment (in writing) to add as the last paragraph under item I.3 to read "The search committee for a Library Director shall be composed of seven members: three tenured library faculty who are not department heads elected by and from the library faculty (but not more than one from any department); one Department head elected by and from the Library faculty; one library staff member elected by and from the library support staff; one tenured faculty member from the teaching faculty designated by the Provost; and one student, selected by the Provost from a list of five nominees submitted by the library faculty and library staff. And to also change sections I.4 by deleting "For all positions except decanal search committees" and replace it with "For all administrative positions, except college deans and the library director." (It was seconded.)

Senator Mullen explained that this change was necessary to guarantee that the library staff would be represented on the Library Director selection and review committees just as teaching faculty are for college deans. The library is considered a professional unit of the library and those in that area would have the most complete knowledge for the search and review process within their area. The library faculty staff is also the one most directly affected by the decisions of the committee so it is paramount that the library staff have that representation on the committee. Senator Mullen also explained that she recognized the importance of faculty and students representation on those committees and pointed out that her amendment includes those members as well. And asked for the

support of the senate on this amendment.

Senator Brent spoke against the Mullen amendment. In terms of procedure, a similar proposal to this amendment has already been voted down more than once by various portions of this body. In committee, similar proposals were voted down. The second time this policy came to the Academic Senate, a similar amendment was offered and that too was rejected. And most recently on September 23, 1998 we did not take a formal vote, but the consensus was that we did not want to alter the language along these lines. This proposal goes beyond any of the other proposals that were presented. In that previous proposals simply said that a majority would be librarians -- that would be 4 out of 7 -- and this says 6 out of 7 would be under the direction of the library/library staff. One other thing was that with this proposal we wanted to go with uniformity and consistency across these various offices. When we start taking it apart and making exceptions we might as well not have this policy at all.

Senator Buzanski wanted to ask how a motion could be introduced given the friendly amendment and why should we just single out one area with such specificity. According to Buzanski, the amendment would destroy the entire policy. He encouraged the senate to vote no on the amendment.

Senator Hegstrom stated that he was inclined to vote in favor of the amendment and stated that the introduction of such an amendment was within the purview of the senate. He asked that the Library get the same kinds of guarantees as College Deans. The friendly amendment is not sufficient. Senator Hegstrom stated that the library has a professional staff that is parallel to the professional staff of colleges different from other administrative duties.

Senator Young made the point that the library belongs to everyone. There is no one expert on the library director.

Senator Mullen responded to Buzanski that the friendly amendment is no guarantee. As a professional entity, librarians are in a better position to understand library management. While the input of others is important, librarians see no reason why outside entities should have control over their area.

Senator Norton asked that this amendment be rejected. While professional librarians have their expertise, the Library Director is too important to be left to a committee consisting of a majority of librarians.

Senator Peter rejects the amendment, although he stated that Senator Mullen is well within her rights, and it is her responsibility, to introduce an amendment that serves the interests of her constituencies. It is an appropriate amendment, but he opposes it. The parallel between colleges and the University Library holds in some instances, but is not complete. College deans serve their colleges, and indirectly serve the university by carrying out their duty to their colleges. The University Librarian serves the entire university. Senator Peter pointed out that while librarians hold academic credentials that are essential, the faculty are professional consumers with expertise. The review process should include all who are served. The faculty to some extent possess an independence of judgement that people who work directly with a particular administrator might lack. That is in part why there are a variety of characteristics on committees mandating tenure and other things. For those reasons, Senator Peter stated that this particular amendment is inappropriate although it was worth debate. Senator Peter suggested that another amendment which did insist that university librarians be represented on the committee but did not create a 6-1 or a 5-2 majority

might be more reasonable, more similar to the status quo.

Senator Canziani followed up on what Senator Peter said. She did not support the quantitative aspect of the amendment, but did support the qualitative content of the amendment. Canziani was concerned that we have an inability to include staff in our policies and highly applauds the idea that faculty, staff and students shall all be represented.

Senator Hegstrom proposed an amendment to the Mullen amendment by striking the phrases "but not more than one from any department" and "one Department Head elected by and from the library faculty."

Questions:

Senator Canziani asked how this amendment affects the insertion of staff into all the AP positions as well, and was informed that it could be done through a separate amendment.

Senator Roth asked a question to clarify that the composition is still consisting of a majority of librarians.

Debate:

Senator Mullen offered a friendly amendment to the Mullen amendment of the Hegstrom amendment. "Three tenured faculty ~~who are not department heads.~~" It was accepted.

Senator Mullen supports the Hegstrom amendment to the Mullen amendment.

Senator Roth urged the senate to vote no on the amendment and rapidly vote no on both amendments. He focused on the nature of the library particularly if the Joint Library is built because we might be dealing with city librarians. He critiqued the notion of the library as an "outside" entity relative to the faculty. Respects the professional skills of the librarians, but the faculty and students should maintain control of the library. Move the question.

Senator Norton proclaimed a Point of Order -- speech was made before the motion.

Senator Roth withdrew his motion.

Senator Mullen commented on the change of the overall document and asked that the amendment not be confused with issues related to the Joint Library project. This is a procedure that will be in place for quite a few years to come.

Senator Hegstrom did not share with Senator Roth that the idea that a negative vote on this would send a message regarding the Joint library project and suggested that Senator Roth's comments had no connection to the amendment to the Mullen amendment. He urged the members of the senate just to address the question whether the change in language would make it a better amendment. Rather than trying to kill my amendment to the amendment on whatever your opinion is on the joint library. Senator Hegstrom stated that he respects Senator Roth's position on the library but wanted to separate that issue from the policy at hand.

Senator Stork called the question. It was seconded. Per voice vote, it was decided to close debate on the amendment to the amendment. A hand vote was necessary; the Hegstrom amendment to the



Mullen Amendment was defeated (18 to 16 and 1 abstention).

Senator Buzanski moved to close debate on the Mullen amendment. It was seconded. Per voice vote, debate was closed. A hand vote was necessary; the amendment was defeated (22 to 10 with 2 abstentions).

Senator Canziani proposed an amendment related to the inclusion of staff. Section I. 3, second line, change to "Faculty, students, administrators, and staff shall all be represented." (It was seconded). Her argument was centered on the notion of staff as part of the internal community as opposed to the external community such as alumni and community representatives.

Questions:

Senator Mesher asked how does that affect the amendment?

Senator Buzanski asked if the first sentence was sufficient since it includes staff but without the amendment.

Senator Canziani felt that it was not inclusive enough.

Senator Brent offered a friendly to edit the policy with the amendment to take out a section that would include staff. It was considered unfriendly and Senator Brent declined to offer it as an amendment. Senator Young asked Senator Brent why that last section was included in the first place. Senator Brent stated that the committee saw no reason why staff could not be included if it was appropriate for the search/review process. The question was called (through a voice vote). A hand vote was necessary and the Canziani amendment was defeated 18-7 with 5 abstentions.

Debate on the proposal AS 1036 now continued:

Senator Cook offered an amendment to include a majority of students for search committees regarding the AVP of Student Affairs. (It was seconded.) According to Senator Cook, the AVP of Student Affairs handles all the areas that deal with student affairs of the university. It is appropriate to have students constitute a majority on the search committee so that the students from different areas could bring in their expertise on the needs of their area.

Questions.

Senator Nellen asked if there was already a process in place where students would be selected. Senator Brent explained that there is an open nomination process where nominations come from the university community and are agreed upon with mutual consent among the Executive Committee and the President.

Senator Young asked how you would get students nominated and why would students have a particular expertise in that area?

Senator Cook advised that if you look at the areas that are included in "Student Affairs" you would see that there are many areas in regard to students. According to Senator Cook, students would be able to put forth the questions that need to be.

Comments were made that each area would have different caveats for different positions and that

the Cook amendment and others like it counteract the goal of having one policy for the search and review process. Debate was closed. A voice vote was taken and the Cook amendment was defeated with 4 abstentions.

Senator Hegstrom moved to send the proposal back to committee with specific instructions that would guarantee voice for students, librarians, and others who might be affected. (It was seconded.)

Comments centered on the work the committee did on this proposal and the general language that was used in this proposal to be inclusive of students and staff when appropriate. The question was moved and seconded. A voice vote taken and debate was closed. A hand vote was necessary for the vote on the Hegstrom amendment to refer to committee. The amendment was defeated (21-11 with 1 abstention).

Debate on AS 1036.

Senator Hamill: Move the question. (It was seconded.) There was a unanimous voice vote to close debate. A voice vote was taken and AS 1036 passed with 1 abstention.

E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee

A.S. 1050 -- Course Scheduling for Lecture Classes -- First Reading

Senator Stork presented AS 1050 on course scheduling using slides and giving a brief history of the current policy. The committee utilized a student survey to better serve student needs and to make course scheduling more efficient. The committee also spoke with chairs and department heads regarding scheduling issues. Senator Stork presented the results of the committee's extensive research on class utilization and student needs, and the benefits regarding parking, pollution reduction, and efficiency of schedules for both students and faculty. This policy is only for a set of 167 lecture classrooms (it does not include laboratories and other such rooms).

Questions and comments on Stork's presentation centered on issues of flexibility for students, faculty, and departments, class utilization and efficiency, and the need for general guidelines as well as issues related to compliance.

#### VII Announcements

1) The chair of the senate reminded the senators of the upcoming Senate Retreat -- November 16, 1998

2) Senator Van Hoof announced opportunities for the Academic Year of 2000-2001 for Resident Directors in France, Italy, Japan, and Mexico. She has applications if interested. It is a twelve-month appointment, but the deadline is December 1, 1998. If you need information, please contact Senator Van Hoof

#### VIII. New Business: None

#### IX. State of the University Announcements

##### A. Associated Students

Senator Cook announced that it was Homecoming week and showed off the Homecoming T-shirt, banners, and some other items that are for sale. The parking lot where the childcare center is going to be built will stay open until the end of the semester. In the interest of time, the AS President indicated that she will send other announcements via e-mail.

##### B. Provost – no report

## C. Vice President for Administration

Senator Kassing gave a report on the parking issue and handed out a brochure that describes some of the alternatives and options that are being developed by the parking staff. Senator Kassing invited the senators to any of the sessions that were listed on the handout given to senators earlier in the meeting.

Senator Mesher was concerned about the disruptions during class times and safety issues created by outside contractors and thought that there were rules in place that might be violated.

## D. Vice President for Student Affairs – no report

## E. Statewide Academic Senators – no report

X. A motion was made to adjourn. It was seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

### FINAL CONSENT CALENDAR PRESENTED

#### TO THE SENATE AND APPROVED

OCTOBER 5, 1999

#### Policy Committees:

Louis Holscher (Fall 98)	Curriculum and Research Committee	Seat M
Suleka Anand	Organization and Government	Seat E
Marilyn Austin	Organization and Government	Seat K
William Nance	Organization and Government	Seat B
Joseph Merighi	Professional Standards	Seat K

#### Operating Committees:

Juana Acrivos	Student Evaluation Review Board	Seat B
Emily Allen	Undergraduate Studies	Seat D
Akthem Al-Manaseer	Library Committee	Seat G
Rai-mon Barnes (Student)	Student Fairness Committee	Seat 2
Jack Bernhardt	Graduate Studies and Research Committee	Seat C
Jane Boyd	Student Success	Seat G
Gong Chen	Program Planning Board	Seat A
Ramona Clark	Student Fairness Committee	EXO
Janet Johnston	Student Evaluation Review Board	Seat E
Sharyl Cross	International Programs and Student Committee	Seat C
Cynthia Llanes	Student Fairness Committee	EXO

Peter Lowenberg	Student Fairness Committee	Seat E
Kurt McMullin	International Programs and Student Committee	Seat H
Matt Olsen (Student)	Student Fairness Committee	Seat 3
Vilma Perry (Staff)	Student Fairness Committee	Seat I
Simon Shim	Continuing Education Committee	Seat D
Dirk Wassenaar	All University Teacher Education Committee	Seat E

Special Agencies:

Earl Bassard	CIO Advisory Board	Seat C
Tim Hill	Campus Planning Board	Seat H
Meghan Horrigan (Student)	CIO Advisory Board	Seat E
Lauren Sosniak	CIO Advisory Board	Seat D

Faculty-At-Large Appointments:

Alejandro Garcia	Undergraduate Studies	Seat C
Tom Means	Student Fairness Committee	Seat C
Alex Sapiens	Enrollment Committee	Seat H

**Appointments -- Information Items**Senate Boards:

*Seth Bates	Program Planning Committee	Seat D
Daniel Holley	Athletics Board	Seat D
Megan Horrigan (Student)	Athletics Board	Seat G
Michael Katz	Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	Seat C
Irene Miura	Athletic Board	Seat A
Dominique Van Hoof	Academic Council on International Programs (CSU)	

\* (Moved from A)

University Writing Requirements Committee:

Jeanne Gilkey  
 Judith Lessow-Hurley  
 Nancie Fimbel  
 Jan Hagemann  
 Peter Master  
 Bonita Cox  
 Scott Rice

Arlene Okerlund  
Lee Dorosz  
AVP Morgan-Foster  
Carol Wilson  
Karen Yoshihara  
Rita Karlsten  
Lois Lund  
Roulette Smith  
Gloria Collins  
Judy Reynolds

New Senators:

Buddy Butler      Senator for Humanities & the Arts Seat 18  
Joseph Merighi      Senator for Social Work      Seat 30  
Swathi Vanniarajan      Senator for Humanities & the Arts Seat 16

---

[ [SJSU Academic Senate Main Page](#) | [Organization Chart of the Senate](#) | [Senate Officers](#) ]  
[ [Senate Handbook](#) | [University Policies](#) | [Sense-of-the-Senate Resolutions](#) | [Minutes of Senate Meeting](#) ]

---



[Back to the SJSU Home Page](#)

---

Send comments or questions regarding this Senate Web site to

[Lydia Rose](#)

Administrative Operations Analyst

Academic Senate Office

San José State University

One Washington Square

San José, CA 95192-0024

voice: (408) 924-2440

fax: (408) 924-2410